

### Remarks

Claims 1, 9, 15, 18, and 20 have been amended. Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-13, 16-17, and 19 have been canceled. Claims 1, 5, 9, 14-15, 18, and 20 are now in the case.

#### I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-8 and 10-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. The applicant respectfully does not agree with the examiner's rejections.

The examiner states that "the pegboard" lacks antecedent basis because it refers to an "imaginary" pegboard. (Examiner's 12/22/2005 office action, pg. 2, paragraph number 2). That is incorrect. Claim 1 clearly refers to "a pegboard" (lines 6-7) and then later refers to the same "the pegboard" (line 10). The pegboard is referred to as having two holes, i.e. a first hole and a second hole. (Present application, claim 1, lines 7 and 10) The first and second prongs of the apparatus claimed are adaptable to be inserted into the first and second holes of the pegboard. (Id. at lines 5-10). The fact that the pegboard is not part of the apparatus claimed does not make the pegboard imaginary. Furthermore, the applicant cannot change the reference to "pegboard" on line 10 to "a" pegboard because then it wouldn't be clear that the first and second prongs can be inserted into first and second holes, respectively, of the same pegboard.

Regarding the rejection concerning "substantially greater", the applicant does not agree with the examiner's rejection however, claim 1 has been amended to delete the term "substantially" with reference to "greater".

Regarding the rejection concerning "can be placed on the extension", the applicant does not agree with the examiner's rejection however, claims 17, 16, 4, 3, and 2 have been rolled into claim 1. With the various limitations rolled in, various slots are defined through which the

extension can be inserted to place a package onto the extension.

## **II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103; Amendments**

Claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 and/or 35 U.S.C. 103 based on various prior art. The applicant has amended or canceled various claims without prejudice to filing another application, such as a continuation or divisional application.

Claims 17-20 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 17, 16, 4, 3, and 2 have been rolled into claim 1, and "substantially" has been deleted in reference to "greater", as previously indicated. Claim 1 is now submitted to be allowable. Claim 17 has been canceled as duplicative.

Claims 5, 14, 15, and 18 are dependent on claim 1 and are submitted to be allowable for at least that reason.


Claim 19 has been rolled into claim 9. Claim 9 is now submitted to be allowable. Claim 19 has been canceled as duplicative. Claim 20 is now dependent on claim 9 and is also submitted to be allowable.

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-13, 16-17 and 19 have been canceled.

## **III. Conclusion**

Claims 1, 5, 9, 14, 15, 18, and 20 are respectfully submitted to be in a condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter J. Tencza Jr.  
Reg. No. 35,708  
Suite 3  
10 Station Place  
Metuchen, N.J. 08840  
(732) 549-3007  
Fax (732) 549-8486